



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

sui cum periculo, he has set up a theory which necessitates his breaking with them at both points. It was he, then, who first felt it necessary "to throw all the editors overboard", while I, finding Mr. Holmes himself no more satisfactory as a pilot than his predecessors, merely dropped him in addition over the taffrail.

As to my translation of the ablative absolute, I am persuaded, that, whatever else may be said against it, it involves no inherent impossibility. If *hoc uno intersecto* (Cicero, Cat. 1.30) taken in connection with *posse*, which is future in sense, is seen to be a disguised future protasis, why should not, by a perfectly logical extension, an ablative absolute when linked with a Subjunctive of Ideal Certainty become the equivalent of a forward looking clause introduced by *etiam si*? Certainly it would be very difficult for anyone to show that it could not. "Inadmissible", then, must be set down as a somewhat categorical pronouncement, even though it comes from so eminent a Latinist as Professor Postgate.

Nor is it of any avail for Mr. Holmes to argue that "if he (Caesar) had intended to convey that the ships did not anchor he would have expressed his meaning differently". This sort of reasoning presupposes that Caesar's language elsewhere is always unequivocal; and that is not true. Is *priores*, for instance (B. G. 7.82.4), substantive or adjective? Schneider holds the former to be true; Mr. Holmes (in his annotated edition) the latter.

My original impulse to discuss this passage came from conviction that the interpretation of it common to our School editions involved a violation of first principles of seamanship, that the situation had not been greatly improved by this later theory of Mr. Holmes, and that, therefore, neither the interpretation given by earlier editors nor Mr. Holmes's own could be retained unless we purposed to charge the Gallic seamen with a very lubberly performance, the shipmasters with incapacity, and Caesar himself with unwonted inadvertency to blundering on the part of his subordinates. To this I, for one, was—and am—averse.

PHILLIPS ACADEMY,
EXETER, N. H.

ALFRED R. WIGHTMAN.

I agree with Mr. Holmes that the vessels about which he, Mr. Wightman, and Mr. King (THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 9.167-168) have been writing did in fact anchor: to take *ancoris iactis* as equivalent to a conditional clause is to convict Caesar, more fully even than is necessary, of writing here without regard to clearness.

In reaching this conclusion I attach much weight to a word to which neither Mr. Holmes nor Mr. Wightman has given any attention—*tamen* (in the group *quae tamen ancoris iactis*, etc.). On either Mr. Holmes's or Mr. Wightman's view of *ancoris iactis* the position of *tamen* before these words is extraordinary. Even the tendency of the Romans to set *tamen* early in its clause

does not account for the position of the word here. Emphasizing the position of *tamen* as pointing a contrast to something expressed or implied in the preceding clause, and taking *ancoris iactis* as equivalent to an adversative clause, I interpret the passage as follows:

. . . no one of these ships could hold its course, but some were swept back to their starting-point, others to the lower (western) part of the island <so that at last they tried anchoring>, but since nevertheless, in spite of anchoring, they found that the billows were filling them, they of necessity, in the teeth of the night, put out toward deep water, and made for the continent.

It seems to me that more or less subconsciously Caesar felt the words *aliae ad inferiorem partem insulae* . . . *deicerentur* as meaning *aliae* . . . *deice entur sed, ne amplius deicerentur, ancoras iacerent*. The idea in *sed* . . . *iacerent* does not find formal expression in this clause, perhaps because the inclusion of such a *sed*-clause within a *sed*-clause would be awkward. At any rate, the position of *tamen* proves to me that, before he wrote *quae*, Caesar had in mind the fact that the vessels under discussion did in fact anchor, as a last desperate resort. It is to this idea of anchoring that *tamen* is opposed; it is this idea of anchoring that *ancoris iactis* repeats.

I wonder that neither Mr. Holmes nor Mr. Wightman has noted the proof so clearly supplied by 4.29.1 that the Roman shipmasters were none too clever; they knew nothing about a very important fact connected with the tides in *Oceanol*! It would be easy to do such shipmasters too much honor. Caesar, of course, had allowed himself none too much time to gather information about Britain and its surroundings; he tells us, also, in 4.20, that there was practically no information to be had, at least from the Gauls. In his campaign against the Veneti, also, he had to get his information in the school of experience!

One point more may be discussed. Neither Mr. Holmes nor Mr. Wightman is exactly right about *magno (sui) cum periculo*. As *cum* shows, Caesar's idea is that the peril was a *concomitant* of the condition represented by *deicerentur*. A similar example is Cicero, Cat. 1.33:

Hisce ominibus, Catilina, cum summa rei publicae salute cum tua peste ac pernicie cumque eorum exitio, qui se tecum . . . iunxerunt, proficiscere. . . .

As Professor Kent rightly pointed out in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 5.162, the *cum*-phrases mean 'attended by', etc. "The translation to makes the phrase express tendency" (so Professor Kent), or consequence (so Mr. Wightman). The *periculum* and the *deicerentur* were, so to say, contemporaneous, coincident, coterminous. C. K.

¹For a very interesting and suggestive examination of Caesar's remark in 3.12.1 about the tides see an article by Professor S. G. Oliphant, entitled Caesar B. G., III., 12.1,—a Review and an Interpretation, in American Journal of Philology 37 (1916).